



**POLICY COMMITTEE**

May 8, 2015

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

Council Chambers (#115)

**Policy Committee Meeting Minutes**

**May 8, 2015 Council Chambers Room 115, City Hall**

*Policy Committee minutes are transcribed in a summarized outline manner. Audio recordings are on file with the City of Bloomington Planning & Transportation Department.*

*Attendance:*

**Policy Committee:** Geoff McKim, Jack Baker, Tony McClellan, Richard Martin, Julie Thomas, Michelle Allen, Bill Williams, Sarah Ryterband, Kent McDaniel, Susie Johnson, Scott Thomas, Tom Micuda, Jason Banach, Andy Ruff.

**Others:** Megan Banta, Herald Times; Chris Sturbaum, City Council; Jeanette Wilson, INDOT; Jay Mitchell, INDOT; David Sabbagh, citizen; Cullen McCarty, Smithville Communications; Randy Lloyd, First Capital Group; Skip Daley, citizen; Reed Adams, Eagle View resident; Emmanuel Nsonwu, INDOT

**MPO Staff:** Josh Desmond, Anna Dragovich, Emily Avers

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes
  - a. April 10, 2015- Richard Martin moved approval. Jack Baker seconded. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.
- III. Communications from the Chair:

Kent McDaniel provided an update on public transportation legislation. The last time we met Senate Bills 379 and 478 had already died. For a while, Senate Bill 478, which concerned public transportation corporation funding, was in a versions of the budget bill. It was removed in the final version. The public mass transportation fund was included in the budget for \$43 million in the first year, which is about \$418,000 more than it had been for the last seven years. That is a 1% increase in funding for public transportation funding statewide. It's a 3 1/3% increase in the second year. There's still a possibility that money could be taken away and used for AMTRAK, but what I'm hearing from INDOT is that is probably not going to happen. We're hoping to have a very small increase in funding this year.
- IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees
  - a. Citizens Advisory Committee-

Sarah Ryterband stated the CAC met to discuss the items on today's agenda. There was some concern expressed about the grade of the Woodlawn railroad crossing.

The other significant action of the CAC was they voted down inclusion of Fullerton Pike from both the TIP and for compliance with the Complete Streets policy.

McDaniel asked what the concern about the Woodlawn Ave project was.

Ryterband said one of the CAC members expressed concern about the grade and how severe the grade will be crossing over the railroad bed itself. It would be nice to have someone from IU come to the CAC to speak about their concerns. The concern about the safety of the grade crossing has consistently been a concern as this project has developed.

b. Technical Advisory Committee-

Tom Micuda stated the TAC met and discussed the same agenda as the CAC. The only item that received any dissent or any protracted discussion was the discussion of Fullerton Pike Phase II project for Complete Streets Compliance. There were several people at the TAC who did vote against Complete Streets compliance due to the lane widths associated with the project. That was the only item that had any dissent with the TAC; everything else was unanimously approved.

V. Reports from the MPO Staff

a. MTP Update-

Josh Desmond updated briefly on the MTP update. Final installation of the model is scheduled for May 14. We will finally have the tool available at the office as well as some results from some model scenarios the consultant has run for us. Once we have that information, we'll have a better understanding of where we stand and what we have to work with going forward. At that time, we'll develop a final plan development schedule to start putting the pieces of the 2040 MTP document together. We'll be able to start rolling those out to the committees as well as the public, because we will need to go back for some final public meetings once we have a final proposed plan.

VI. Old Business

VII. New Business-

McDaniel said there are three action items. Members of the public are allowed to speak on these items. We limit testimony to 5 minutes from each person on each issue to make their comments. The purpose is for the committee to hear your comments, it is not intended as a cross-examination.

a. 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan\*-

Desmond presented. The 2030 LRTP currently in effect for the MPO is set to expire in less than a week. If we do not have a new plan in place, our TIP will be frozen. Our strategy was to come up with a bridge plan using the current 2030 plan to create an interim 2035 plan. The bridge plan would meet the basic criteria for an active transportation plan so we can adopt it, keep ourselves valid for the next several months, and then move forward on a 2040 LRTP. The 2035 plan is included in the packet. We updated our demographic projects and financial projections along a consistent line. There were some minor project list changes, mostly because some of the projects in the 2030 plan have been completed. We updated the SAFETEA-LU compliance appendix to the new Map 21 compliance appendix. We also made general changes to reflect the new time horizon of 2035. That will take us to a 20 year time horizon so we can adopt a valid plan. This would technically open another 5 year window, but we don't intend to take that long to get this plan updated. Our goal is still to adopt a 2040 plan by the end of this calendar year. We had the required public comment period. This closed on May 3<sup>rd</sup>. We received no comments from the public on the document. We did receive a few comments from INDOT which

were mostly editing comments. The document was reviewed by the CAC and TAC. Both voted unanimously to recommend the PC adopt the plan.

Ryterband moved to adopt. Baker seconded.

No public comment.

**Motion passed 12:1.**

b. Complete Streets Project Compliance\*-

Anna Dragovich presented. A requirement of the MPO Complete Streets Policy is that the MPO Policy Committee certifies by resolution the proposed projects are compliant with the policy. There are three projects up for review today: the 17th St. Reconstruction project, the Woodlawn Railroad Crossing project, and Fullerton Pike Phase II project. By saying these projects are Complete Streets compliant, the PC would be concluding the Complete Streets policy is applicable to the projects, that the materials submitted meet the information requirements of the policy and that the project descriptions generally satisfy the intent of the policy.

- (1) 17<sup>th</sup> St. Reconstruction- This was presented at the last meeting as part of the FY 2016-2017 TIP. This is to reconstruct W 17<sup>th</sup> St where the INDOT I69 project for the Vernal Pike overpass would end and to the east where the 17th and Arlington roundabout is located. This project would have two travel lanes with a side path on one side and sidewalk on the other. From the report the LPA provided, it appears the neighborhoods in the area are in support of the project. Federal funding for the project would be \$3,149,726 with a local share of \$1,617,175 for design, ROW, and construction.

Jack Baker asked the proposed lane width.

Micuda said at this point we believe the lane widths will be 11 feet. The design process is not done, but that's the preliminary idea.

- (2) Woodlawn Railroad Crossing- This project would construct an at grade railroad crossing on Woodlawn between 12th St. and 11th St. This is part of a larger IU project to go from 17<sup>th</sup> St to 12<sup>th</sup> St. Federal funding would be allocated to one block. The federal funding amount is \$395,118. The local share reflected is for the entire project from 12th St to 17th St. That amount is \$1.4 million.

Baker asked what the grade will be and if it meets guidelines.

Desmond said he is not sure what the grade requirement is, but it will have to be satisfactory to the railroad or the railroad will not install the crossing there.

Baker said he knows some of the older crossings have actual humps. He would be surprised if that was allowed any more.

McDaniel sat in on some meetings about this project a few years ago. He thinks the railroad was requesting 23 feet of clearance. He doesn't know what that would make the grade.

Martin said when he looked through the project statements in connection with the Complete Streets requirements, the 17th St and Woodlawn Railroad crossing are the

same. Are there different measurable outcomes or project timelines or key milestones or project costs between the two projects?

Dragovich said this is a typo. The project cost reflected in the chart with the map is correct. The public participation process...

Martin asked if we needed to include these with our certification for Complete Streets.

Desmond said we somehow managed to cross these two different projects. We may need to provide additional information on Woodlawn.

Martin said his question is if we have the correct information to submit.

Desmond said we do.

Martin said part of the motion will include correcting this information.

Johnson asked Ryterband to talk about the discussion the CAC had about the grade.

Ryterband said one member had considerable concerns. He was anticipating a grade similar to the Vernal Pike crossing. He was concerned pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles might have difficulty. He wanted to know what the grade was and the CAC doesn't have that information. What is the safety of this particular crossing and does it reflect what is best for all modes of transportation at that crossing?

Johnson said her recollection of the project is they had to do some drainage to keep the water away from the railroad track. Her memory is the crossing isn't a hump so much as it is a "U".

Ryterband asked what that will mean in terms of the grade as we cross that railroad. The CAC has never seen the plans. The question was raised whether this is indeed safe.

Johnson has seen the plans but it's been a long time. She doesn't recall having a concern about the grade. IU intends this to be a very significant pedestrian and bicycle and public transportation corridor. It's going to be the gateway to IU's athletic campus.

Ryterband said they know that much. No one has been able to tell them what the grade is.

- (3) Fullerton Pike Phase 2- This is the project that picks up where Fullerton Pike Phase I leaves off just west of Walnut moving west to the Rogers St/Fullerton Pike intersection. There would be a new signal on Rogers St and Gordon Pike, new turn lanes on Rogers St, and a widened bridge over Clear Creek. A sidewalk would be constructed on the south side and a side path would be constructed on the north side. The federal funding amount for this phase of the project is \$2.6 million. The local share is \$2.8 million. That includes design, ROW, and construction. She added we will be tracking all three of the projects for Complete Streets Policy through the quarterly meetings.

Martin said this is the continuation of an existing project. Do we have Complete Streets Compliance on the part of the project that was already approved? Is the design for this section essentially the same as the design for that section?

Bill Williams said the design is the same. There will also be a transit pull off at the Kroger in Phase I.

Micuda requested the discussion be conducted project by project because there are members of public here to comment on multiple projects. He made a motion to take public comment and to vote on each project individually.

McDaniel said we can do that. We don't need to make a motion to do it that way.

Ruff asked if the item has been split to 3 votes.

McDaniel said it has. The first item on the list is 17th St, so we will deal with that first.

Martin said this is a segment between construction the county did on Vernal Pike which had one set of standards and construction the city did on Arlington St. Does this section have the same design standards of those two sections? Is it different? Are those other sections different from each other? He's trying to get a feel what this will feel like driving from the west side to 17th. Will there be a difference in the experience in the roadway and, if so, what kind of difference is going to exist?

Micuda said the Vernal Pike/17<sup>th</sup> St overpass connection is set up to have a side path on the north side and a sidewalk on the south side. This proposal would have similar facilities, so we would be consistent with the direction of the I69 project. We would try to keep lane widths at 11 feet. We might be slightly narrower than the over pass. Those lanes may be 12 feet or larger so there may be some narrowing of lanes as you get into the city's section. There would be a standing curb, tree plots, and the pedestrian bicycle facilities would be similar.

Martin asked if pedestrians would have to cross the road to get onto one trail or the other.

Micuda said they would be able to stay one side of the road and negotiate as pedestrians. Bicycles and pedestrians would have full access to the north side.

\*\*\*Baker made a motion to accept the 17th St Reconstruction as Complete Streets Compliant. Ryterband seconded.

Floor was opened for public comment.

Chris Sturbaum spoke as a City Council representative. Some of this project is in his district. He's been talking to some of the neighborhoods involved. We need this connection and he is very much in favor of making it. Without it, we just kind of fall off the road coming from two directions. Narrowing the road to 11 feet reflects the neighbor's interests. They have just experienced the roundabout construction and the invasion of that project. Narrowing the road will also signal you're coming in to the city. The neighborhood wants to make this connection and he is in support of it.

Randy Lloyd spoke as a concerned citizen. He commended all the MPO members. It's a little known group. He reiterated what Sturbaum said. This project is truly an important project, especially in terms of long range planning. You look at what will be the I69 corridor and look at the infrastructure in the area and it is clear this would be money well spend to improve this area. With the investment the city has already

made up there, this could be a catalyst for a lot of other good developments to happen. He encouraged approval.

Sue Tuey lives on W 17<sup>th</sup> St. The neighborhood association is in favor of improvements in the road. It's an incredibly dangerous road if you walk down it. People walk down it to go to Tri-North Middle School and Mills Pool. She sees them and there is no place to walk. She hadn't seen the plan before and she wouldn't say the neighborhood association agrees with the plan. When we look at West Vernal Pike on the other side of 37, it pretty much looks like a wasteland from the road improvement that was done. W 17th is a rather established neighborhood. The houses are 180 years old, some people have lived there over 60 years and the houses are close to the road. She measured on her own property based on the road coming out of the round about and the side paths and she estimated we're going from 21 feet to 52 feet. That's 15 feet more on either side of the road, which in one case brings the road less than 13 feet from the front porch. When she adds up the 10 foot bike pass, 9 feet of green space, 5 feet of side walk, another 5 feet of green space, it's big. It means cutting down a lot of old trees. That's the one thing some of the residents are very concerned about. She understands people can make arguments this is going to improve our future and it's possible that 30 years down the line there will be 100 bicycles coming by in a day. She has the feeling from listening to this meeting that Safe Streets compliance is not something that can be changed very easily. She encouraged the committee to think about the impact on established neighborhoods and diversity within Bloomington. We do need at least a side walk and some other improvements to the road like getting rid of some of the bumps.

Liz Irwin spoke for the Bloomington Chamber of Commerce. She asked for clarification on the procedure. Are you just voting project by project on Complete Streets compliance and then is there another discussion about whether or not these project should be funded? She wanted to say, at least for the 17th St project, this is something the Chamber of Commerce is in favor of. We appreciate all the work the City and the County have put in to all the projects we need to consider as a community when we're looking at the I69 project. This project is very important. Certainly the ability to have sidewalks and bike paths as part of the project is great for all citizens, but we think any time we can improve east/west connectivity, that's really important. While she can't speak specifically to what it means to be Complete Streets compliant, she said the Chamber of Commerce is in favor of the project, both in terms of funding it and making sure it is complete.

Martin said the concern he has is whether this section of road was similar to the other is to make sure the experience of travel doesn't create some sort of discontinuity that would create a safety factor for us. Every time roads change widths, people behave differently. I want to make sure there is some sort of compatibility or consistency there. The other thing has to do with whether the narrower lanes will be satisfactory for transit. This will end up being a transit corridor at some point in time because it will be the way to get across the northern part of the county without going across the bypass. Bus routes will tend to take this because this is where the people will be, rather than the bypass because nobody lives on the bypass. This has to be a corridor that can serve transit as well.

\*\*\*Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.

\*\*\*Micuda made a motion to consider the Woodlawn Railroad Crossing project to be considered complete streets compliant subject to documentation being provided by staff to augment what's been already stated. Williams seconded.

Martin verified Micuda included a request the text be updated.

There was no public comment.

\*\*\*Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.

Micuda said the issue the City brought to the County and to Bill Williams is the issue of lane width associated with the project. It's our understanding the project would have one 16 foot wide lane in each direction with bike lanes striped in the project, which would take away some of the width, and a 16 foot wide median. From the City's perspective, the issue of concern is speed. The wider you make travel lanes, even when you accommodate for bikes, the higher the chance you may have speed concerns. There is a direct correlation between lane width and the speed drivers go. It's been studied and documented that as you widen lanes, speeds exponentially increase. We relayed those concerns to Williams and the County. The City's concern is not a need issue, it's more of a design issue.

Williams went back to the history of the project. We did originally have 5 lanes, with two lanes going in each direction. We've cut one of those in each direction. We have a boulevard approach and we have to accommodate emergency vehicles, which is part of Complete Streets compliance. With the boulevard approach, we would have curb on both sides to provide a way for an emergency vehicle to get around a vehicle traveling down the roadway. With a 16 foot wide width, that vehicle would be able to get off to the side and the emergency responder would be able to get around. We would stripe it at 12 feet for the lane width and mark it for a bike path. I do have my design engineer here in the crowd if you have any specific design questions related to the project.

Baker asked if Williams had any visuals or profiles today that would help us.

Williams provided a profile of the proposed street plan.

Martin said some time ago a policeman was in before the MPO talking about a problem on the new 3<sup>rd</sup> St where, because there are gutters with curbs on both sides of the road, that when both lanes are occupied, there was no way for them to get their vehicles around and they had to wait. That's why this issue comes up. When you have lanes that have full curb and gutter and they are one direction, you have to be able to find a way to get emergency vehicles around. That's why they get to be a little bit wider. It's not the same issue you have on streets that have two way travel. When you create these boulevards between travel lanes you have to create wider widths so you can get emergency vehicles through. Fortunately, we can take advantage of the wider width to provide opportunities for bicycles to use dedicated striped traffic lanes on each side of the road, which would help to reduce the risk of the conflict you see when they end up in the same travel lane as vehicles.

Baker said if you look at the section in the profile between intersections, we have 16 feet, a couple of feet taken out on the inside by the median, then there will be striping that takes out another 3 or 4 feet for a bicycle lane which shows this going down from about 16 feet to about a 10 or 11 foot actual running lane. Of course, it's different when you get up to the intersections. Those are much wider because you have turn lanes and things like that.

Johnson requested the profile be displayed on the overhead.

Williams said we are trying to shoot for at least to have 11-12 foot travel lanes. That's a function of the Indiana Design Manual that we have to comply with. The lanes wouldn't be any less 11 feet.

Baker said that was why he'd asked for the lane width on 17th, which is 11 feet. Here we also have a lane width of about 11 feet.

Desmond pointed out the features on the profile. There is a 10 foot multi use path with a 5 foot buffer between the path and the curb. There is a curb and gutter section of about 2'7", which leaves a paved area of 16 feet to the standing curb in the center median. That profile is reflected on other side with the only change being a 5 foot sidewalk on the opposite side. The median is also 16 feet from the outside of the curb to the outside of the curb running down the center of the road.

Johnson asked for the pavement width from the front of the gutter to the front of the median.

Desmond said 16 feet.

Johnson clarified that is not the back side of the gutter.

Desmond said this is the front of the concrete gutter. There is another 2 feet to the back side of the gutter.

Geoff McKim asked the reason for the width of the median. Could it be narrowed and still have accomplished the goals of providing pedestrian safety islands?

Williams said it's a combination of factors. Initially, it was for aesthetic reasons. The width itself is just a function of keeping the through lane the same width. That way, when we get into an intersection, we can reduce it down to a 12 foot left hand lane and still have the 4 foot concrete barrier curb that's required at all intersections in accordance with the design manual. There is an opportunity to narrow a portion of the median down east of Rogers Street because there are no driveways along there. We could narrow the median there to about 10 feet. The lane width would remain the same.

McKim asked at what point in the funding cycle do all these design elements need to be finalized? Could this project be approved in the TIP and design elements still changed?

Williams said the later phases will definitely have to come back and go through the design stage with INDOT. Funding requests will keep coming back here.

Johnson asked if there was an opportunity to provide a buffered bike lane to reduce the travel lane to 11 feet, while still allowing room for emergency access.

Patrick Wooden is a Project Manager from American Structurepoint. He has been working on the engineering assessment for the overall Fullerton Pike corridor. He is currently the project manager for the Phase I portion and he is familiar with the Phase II portion. The reason for the 14 foot travel lane is to be in compliance with the INDOT design manual, which requires a 2 foot buffer between the travel lane and the curb face. The curb and gutter there is measured at 2'7". It is comprised of a 2 foot gutter section and a 7" curb section so we have the two foot offset on the right side of

the traveling vehicle. We then have, on the left side of those traveling vehicles, the 2 foot dimension that is shown there. The width between the curb face on the left and the curb face on the right is 18 feet. That is 16 feet of asphalt plus an additional 2' of the concrete gutter section on the right. The 18 foot dimension was designed to allow a passenger vehicle to pull off to the right while still providing the space necessary for an ambulance or fire truck to bypass on the left or for a patrol officer to have a vehicle pulled off to the right for a traffic citation while still providing enough width for vehicles to bypass on the left. It's an allowance for the emergency responders in either situation. The space we're going to use for that would include striping to for an on-street bike facility. When a bike facility is adjacent to a curbed section, as it would be in this instance, the minimum required width of a bike lane is 5 feet, but you are allowed to use the 2 foot gutter section as part of that. The 14 foot travel lane can be striped to eliminate 3 feet to provide create an 11 foot travel lane width so that in normal travel operations, there is an 11 foot section, just a single travel lane, in each direction.

Baker said he understands the bike sections in the travel lane, but we also have a side path. It seems we're being redundant to have basically two bike lanes. A lot of bikers would use the side path. Why would we want one on the street and why wouldn't we reduce the street section by that amount?

Wooden said there is no reason to have an on street bike path adjacent to an off-street multi-use path. It is strictly to accommodate the desire of the MPO to have narrower travel lanes while still meeting the requirement of having that minimum 18 feet to allow for a stopped vehicle or an emergency ride around. If you do not provide that minimum 18 feet in width, you are going to have traffic which will not allow for an emergency vehicle to bypass. The lanes wouldn't be wide enough to accommodate parallel vehicles. The accommodation for the bike lane is just to reduce the travel lane to 11 feet while still meeting the 18 foot width to accommodate emergency vehicles to bypass traffic.

Baker said the short answer is that by standards you cannot reduce the travel lane to 18 feet. It's just a matter of if you want to stripe a section of it for bicycling, but you've got to have the 18 feet.

Wooden said by standard the minimum travel lane width is 12 feet but to provide for emergency run-arounds, the minimum width would be 18 feet. Because the Complete Streets policy says we are to accommodate emergency response vehicles, that was the purpose behind making that wider, was for that accommodation.

Micuda asked if the median was not present in the road design, would the 18 foot emergency run around requirement still be a requirement?

Wooden said it would not. The 18 foot requirement is for traffic going in a single direction. If you eliminate the median, either through a center turn lane or just with two turn lanes, even in opposite directions, people can pull off to the side and you can run around. One of the other reasons for the raised boulevard section along the corridor was the presence along Fullerton Pike of these north/south trails that are there and specifically within the Phase II section, the Bloomington Rail Trail. The location of that trail basically acts as a mid-block crossing, so the median buffer zone acts as a safety refuge for bicyclists as they cross the roadway where they only have to be concerned with traffic in a single direction, go to the median safety refuge and then be concerned with the opposite direction to complete their voyage across the corridor. So there was a safety component to the raised buffer as well.

Baker said we're maybe getting a little too deep in terms of design, but in terms of Complete Streets, what is the accommodation for people crossing outside of the intersections. For example, will we have any zebra striping or anything for bicyclists that would be not at intersections? Are there any accommodations like that along the length? Zebra stripes, flashing lights or some such accommodation?

Wooden said there are pavement markings that will be designed for pedestrian crossings, bicycle facility crossings, especially at the locations of the trails along the corridor. For the Phase II specific Rogers St to west of Walnut St, that would be at the intersection of Rogers St and at the Bloomington Rail Trail.

Bakers asked if there would be anything in between.

Wooden indicated there would not be anything in between.

Ryterband asked how high is the median strip?

Wooden said the curb height is 6". It's is considered a barrier curb so the vehicle would hit the curb and bounce off.

Ryterband said the whole raised median strip is only 6" high. Can you give an estimate of total square footage or acreage of the extent of boulevard we're talking?

Wooden could not.

Ryterband said it sounds like the residents could cross in the middle of the road since it's only going to be 6" high and then once they're safe on the island run across the other section of 18'.

Wooden said there would not be any guardrail or barrier set in place to restrict that type of movement.

Ruff said someone commented earlier the concern of the emergency vehicle being able to pass is sort of self imposed issue, because it's based on the design of the roadway. With a more traditional or two lane facility without the raised median, it's not an issue. Could future county governments convert this corridor relatively easily to a four lane facility without having to come to the MPO or to any other approval process than just to decide to do that? Relative to the overall cost of the project, what would it cost to go ahead and eliminate that median once it's built like this? How much is it in terms of what it originally cost to go in and scrape that 6" median? You've done most of the expenses.

Desmond said the second question he will have to defer to Williams or the design consultant because he doesn't know the exact cost break down. For the first part of the question, if they wanted to do it with purely local funding and not use MPO funding to do it, they could make whatever changes they want to the road corridor and the MPO wouldn't be part of it. On the flip side, if they did want to have federal funds to participate in that project, we would be back having this conversation about the project

Ruff asked if any one would like to talk about the relative cost to convert this once you had this design on the ground. He asked if it would be wrong to say that it wouldn't be that costly to make the conversion. What's going to be underneath that 6" of

median? Is there going to be any kind of base in place in the median way? He assumes initially the whole width would be cleared. Will there be a base under?

Wooden said there are requirements in pavement design that the preparation for pavement extends wider than the actual width of the pavement so there is no degradation at the edges of the pavement lanes. The roadway is prepared a little bit wider than the actual pavement as a design measure, but not all the way through the 16' median section there.

Ruff said there are similar refuge features on trail crossings at roadways that have two-lane designs where there is a refuge by bumping out at that location rather than the whole corridor. That's rather easily done.

Julie Thomas asked Williams to address the idea of having a median and 2 lanes of traffic versus 2 lanes of traffic and a center turn lane that runs throughout. She requested Williams discuss the impact of traffic speed in general and the neighborhood impact.

Williams said the main reason for the boulevard approach is for aesthetics reasons and also for safety. We heard a comment about Vernal Pike where we've got a center turn lane with lanes on the outside. The comments we heard at the public hearing and during the CAC is that people do not want to see that. With a boulevard type approach, it not only helps to hopefully slow traffic down but also assists with the aesthetics.

Ryterband asked if Williams was suggesting a median design would slow traffic. That's not the experience we've had on West 3rd where there are extensive sections of "boulevard".

Williams said that is a 4 lane section.

Ryterband said it has wide lanes and a median that has not had the effect of slowing traffic speed down. In terms of aesthetics, it would seem leaving more trees in place and leaving more of this residential neighborhood intact would improve the aesthetics more than putting in a grassy knoll in the middle of the roadway.

Williams said one of the amenities with the grass median is it provides a pedestrian refuge when they're crossing the roadway versus if we just have 2 lanes of traffic out there as Wooden mentioned. There would be 16 feet you would be crossing to get to the refuge and then the rest of the way across the road versus 24'.

Ruff said we have a lot of roads in the community that are higher volume than this that don't have a continuous turn lane the entire length of the roadway. What justifies that as the only other reasonable alternative to not having the median?

McDaniel asked who that was addressed to.

Ruff said any one.

Wooden said through Phase II there isn't really a two-way left that is called for. The raised median is called for throughout the entirety of Phase II with the exception of the intersection at Rogers St.

Ruff said he thought he heard someone question the necessity of the median and the alternative was presented as a left turn lane along the entire corridor.

Wooden said the division between the through travel lanes in each direction is a median buffer zone. When you get to an intersection, it allows for left turn lanes at specific locations. In this instance, left turn lanes at Rogers St.

Ruff said that no one was actually saying the corridor would need a center turn lane in any scenario. That's not what is being suggested here as the necessary alternative to not having the median.

Wooden said the median was proposed for aesthetic reasons as well as for safety reasons for pedestrian and trail use crossings.

Baker asked if the median would be planted with trees that would provide a site barrier.

Williams said there would be landscaping there. He's not sure about trees. Those would probably be planted on the back side of the curbs and we would probably have native grasses in the median for low maintenance purposes.

Baker said grasses but not trees? Has any thought been given to planting trees in the median? Isn't that done on 3rd St?

Williams said it is done on 3rd St. There is also have a very expensive irrigation system on 3rd St to go along with it.

Martin said planting trees in the median is a very expensive proposition, both to do it and to maintain. It's something we can do if we can find the money but generally, the money doesn't exist. The maintenance that's going to be done on 3rd St. is part of the cost of the project in the long term. We have issues with street trees no matter where we put them. We tend to put continuous turn lanes in areas where we expect to have employment growth and development and that's why you see it on Vernal Pike, because the area out west on 17th St is a commercial employment area and we will be getting more truck traffic to service the employment that will occur out there. This area is far more residential and we would like to see a more residential character to the streetscape in this area. How we build roads depends a little bit up on the neighborhood in which they exist but it also depends upon what traffic they're going to have to serve. We have to remember that this is going to be a major east/west corridor whether we like it or not. What we need to do is to find an appropriate way to accommodate that traffic in ways we know are going to be effective. A boulevard is a nice thing. People drive slower on boulevards than they do on those through turn lane road ways because in a boulevard you know you're constrained. You don't see people speeding along the 46 bypass because there's a boulevard atmosphere there. The traffic is actually slower along the bypass now than it was when it was a two lane road. The way we build roads can have an effect upon how they are used. We would like to site them and build them appropriately for the areas where they are going to be used as well as accommodate the traffic we know is going to be there. It's always going to be a balancing act between all these forces. There are no easy decisions here. Over the long term, this looks a whole lot better than what is going to happen there if we don't do something. We can turn it into a commercial boulevard but we don't have the commerce there and we don't really want commerce there. We would like to make sure it's a reasonable east/west corridor because it's going to be

used that way. I understand people's concerns but we still have to maintain the safety of the traveling public and that's what we're really concerned about.

\*\*\*Baker made a motion that the MPO certify Fullerton Pike Phase II as Complete Streets Compliant. Martin seconded.

McDaniel reminded committee members they will get another opportunity to speak before the vote. He opened the floor for public comment.

Isabella Beitvashahi lives on West Gordon Pike. She asked why a median? Are the emergency vehicles for her kids? How things stand, she doesn't even know how they're going to get to school. There's a projected intersection 50 feet from her home. If you see a yellow light and you're in a hurry with kids you picked up from Bachelor, isn't it human nature you're just going to gun it? That's right in front of her house. If you're saying medians are going to slow traffic because you don't want to hit the median, aren't you going to hit her house? Her family has already sacrificed a lot by understanding this is coming. Help us. She doesn't want a median. She wants her kids to be safe. She wants the character of her neighborhood to be beautiful. That's already gone down the tubes. When the neighbors get together they talk about what's happening. How hard it has been to get information about what the impact will be where she lives. She has two kids and two dogs and she has a home to maintain, which is hard and is even harder because she doesn't feel safe because she doesn't know what the plans are going to be and she doesn't know what the future is. She can't move. She's stuck. Safety, safety, safety. School zone or no school zone, people are going to drive how they drive. Think about yourself when you were younger. If you're in a hurry with kids or to get somewhere, aren't you going to go fast? What about us? She feels like she's being punished for being a homeowner. Politicians say they love families but they don't if this project is going to happen. She feels like she has nothing. The only place she has is her home.

Joan Keeler is a concerned citizen who lives in the Bachelor area neighborhood. Her comments are prompted by the purpose stated in the Complete Streets Policy of incorporating community values and qualities, including environment, scenic, aesthetic, historical and natural resources as well as safety and mobility. Despite the finding of no significant impact, most of the people who live in this area wholeheartedly disagree because our property values, our quality of life and our safety will be severely impacted by this. Construction and the ongoing increased traffic will have a deleterious impact, including the disruption of natural areas. It will produce noise pollution, particulate pollution, and affect our air quality. We see this community as predominantly pastoral and residential. The public use of trails and sidewalks will be impacted by fast moving arterial type traffic. It's not aesthetically in accordance with the current context of the neighborhood. Homes along this roadway have already been negatively affected as far as their property values. We've had some input from local realtors that defends that. People use the sidewalk to walk dogs, middle school students do some of their athletic activities along there. She doesn't see a huge roadway as being supportive of that. Per the county's estimated long range transportation program, there will be a 40% increase in traffic over a 5-year period. We don't even know if this estimate includes the increased traffic I69 will bring. We feel this plan emphasizes the desire to move traffic more quickly at the expense of people who live on and near the corridor. She does not believe there has been adequate public participation as per the Complete Streets information requirements. The first announcement was in the newspaper the day of the meeting, which took place during the day when many people were at work. Other people only listen to

one radio station and had no way of knowing this was going on. There has been confusion over who's owned which part, what belongs to INDOT and I69 and which parts of the project had to do with the county. We expected responses to the many questions posed at the December meeting, but there has been no public forum before today where we could talk about it and give our input. The newly released tabulation of the comments and questions leave many of the concerns unanswered. We would like to have an open exchange of ideas and know our concerns are being adequately addressed. She hopes we can put this project on hold until some of these issues are ironed out so the neighborhood and whole-heartedly support this project.

Reid Adamson has been a resident of Eagleview since 2000. Before that, he lived on Gordon Pike. He is here to speak in support of the project as a resident who lives right by it. When he was shown the house on Gordon Pike in 1992 it was obvious this project was coming. In his mind, it should have been done quite a while ago. The traffic in the area has grown substantially in the last 20 years. We need east/west connectors. He encouraged the MPO to look at others, not just at Fullerton Pike, but improving Church Lane and Tapp Rd even further to increase the connectivity there. It's miserable getting around with I69 construction because there are very few pathways in. He thinks the median proposed is very important. He is a frequent user of the rail trail and when he lived on Gordon Pike, his kids would play at Bachelor all the time. He thinks the grassy median as a safe way to get across will be incredibly important. Turning that into a wide 2 lane road would make it harder for kids to get across safely. He's found crossing a one-way street is always easier, even if the traffic is heavier. You walk around the square and it's easier to cross the 2 and 3 lane roads where the traffic is going one way than it is to cross a 2 lane street where the traffic is going in opposite directions. There is a lot about this plan that can improve safety. I encourage you to keep the public involved so we can make input as the project goes forward but I think it needs to go forward. We need to have the connector.

Ameer Beitvashahi lives on Gordon Pike. It's difficult to keep his comments to Complete Streets Compliance since a lot of people have been referencing the INDOT design manuals to support that while the INDOT design manual itself states that these main arteries should not go through neighborhoods. When he brought that up, the official response was that it doesn't go through a neighborhood. Surely there's a better way for people to cross a trail than to run from one end of the road to a median and then from the median to the other side of the road. I've seen better ways in Bloomington, including pedestrian bridges. Approaching the intersection from both directions is a downhill grade, so if you have what is now an 18 foot wide road, whether it's an 11 foot travel lane, people are going to speed. The accommodation that's been made is this median is for people to run to and from and it doesn't make sense. I've heard the justification before that this is going to be an east/west corridor whether we like it or not so we're just going to have to deal with it. That's not going to be good enough for the residents. It really shouldn't be good enough for the MPO or for Bloomington. I understand there's a traffic problem and it needs to be solved but with all the questions we've raised here, I'm not sure how it could be Complete Streets Compliant.

Mary Ann Williams lives on a busy street in the Highlands. Though it is residential, it functions as a commercial artery. There are construction trucks, gravel trucks, concrete trucks, delivery trucks, trash haulers, and automobiles every day. Our subdivision is being used as a cut through to connect Gordon Pike to Rockport Rd on roads that are not designed to handle heavy traffic. She is opposed to the Fullerton

expansion project as it has been presented. It does not make sense that congestion will be eased with this project since Rogers, the first north/south vertical off Fullerton, will channel thousands of new cars each day should Fullerton connect to I69. The south side of the county has exit/entrance points that are or will be closed due to I69. Unless plans are changed, much of that traffic pressure from the south will flow to Fullerton. Of the 87 public comments that were given, 51 were opposed to the project. It does not make sense to continue until a greater consensus can be reached. There are many complex issues waiting to be answered. How can we proceed when there are so many unaddressed issues and gaps in the planning? Then there are the safety issues. The lanes are to be 16 feet wide. Wide lanes lead to high speed. The posted speed limit will be 35 MPH with 40 MPH design speed. This is unthinkable for residential schools and neighborhoods. Children will walk back and forth to school in the dark for much of the year. The Chamber of Commerce in Bloomington calls for commercial development along Fullerton, yet this plan says a significant volume of truck traffic is not anticipated due to the limited commercial and industrial development to which the roadway leads. That's confusing and pretty internally contradictory. How many people in this room have driven or walked along Fullerton in the last 90 days? The only area for commercial development is at S Rogers and Rhorer Rd. Tapp Rd has the potential for economic development much more than Fullerton. In terms of public participation, the process was foreshortened. One-way communication does not work. This certification of public involvement, the official public hearing transcript and the disposition of the comments received is diminutive for the amount of effort and concern expressed by the people. Fullerton expansion does not comply with Complete Streets policy. Complete Streets policy is visionary. Let's devise a planning process based on open creative dialogue, not just one way communication. Let's create a traffic pattern in southwest Bloomington we can be proud of and enjoy and not just tolerate for decades to come. A pattern that contributes to the environment, community and human living.

Mark Gahl lives on west Gordon Pike. He found out some things today he didn't know before, for example that there would be a raised median. This is typical of the whole project. Residents of this neighborhood are kind of the last to know. The only information he's gotten from this whole project was one letter from Structurepoint about 3 or 4 years ago. If you're going to drastically change the neighborhood, don't you think that we should be informed about these things? I wasn't informed by my realtor either. I'm very disappointed about that. There's tons of traffic there right now as it is. He lives on the corner of Gordon Pike and Rogers and there's a lot of traffic. If you connect it to an interstate it's going to be a lot more and it's just not going to be as nice a place to live. He's disappointed with the lack of information that's been provided to the residents of this neighborhood. If you put a median there, when all of us go home, what do we do? Will we have to drive up all the way up to the end of the street, make a "U" turn and then turn back? You can't drive across a median. There are no trails on that side of the road anyway. Rails-to-Trails is on the east side of Rogers. I could understand a median there, but not on the west side of the street. It's very disappointing. This is a middle class neighborhood that's relatively quiet and peaceful with a lot of homeowners, not home renters who you can just flick aside. It's disappointing that my peaceful neighborhood is going to change and I hope you can do something about it.

Liz Irwin said they aren't planners at the Chamber of Commerce. They leave the planning up to the folks in the city and the county who are the experts. We rely on their judgment. From our perspective, this project is about the ability to increase opportunities to move from east to west. That involves employers, employees, businesses and the movement of goods and freight to different parts of the city.

There have been a lot of opportunities for input from the various stakeholders. She recognizes sometimes people feel they don't necessarily get a chance to say everything they would like to say, but this project has been on the county books for decades. It's been part of the long range transportation plan for a long time. The county has made concessions about how many lanes there are going to be and various things and she thinks we need to keep that in mind as we're looking at this. We've certainly heard a lot of different perspectives on lane widths and the need for a median versus turn lanes and different ways to look at safety. I'm not an expert on those sorts of things, so I'll defer to those who know more about it and say that regardless of what we end up with, lane widths, medians and other things, we have to keep in mind the safety for all citizens. The Chamber is very much in favor of this project and we would like to see it move forward, whether or not it's Complete Streets compliant. Thank you and we hope you will make decisions that will allow this project to move forward.

Skip Daley is slightly confused about what he's speaking about. He doesn't have a lot to say about the Complete Streets policy. He is a resident in the affected area. He makes the opportunity to speak to a lot of residents and neighbors and they are all unequivocally in support of this opportunity. He thanked the MPO for taking this project, which has been on the books for decades, and actually making it happen, and for having the foresight to understand we need that connection and the opportunity to make our streets safer. You're probably well aware of the flooding that happens between Walnut and Rogers on Gordon Pike there and you're probably also aware that the Highlands and Eagleview neighborhood are used as a cut through in order to get to 37 and to the other side. He's a little surprised to hear comments in regard to the shock of this project and not being informed as to its merits. When he moved to town in 2006 it was abundantly clear that the neighborhood was specifically designed to become that corridor, due to the utility and sidewalk offsets on both sides of Gordon Pike. There's not a whole lot of an excuse to understand that this project is important. So thank you for making it happen and I just want to thank you also for allowing the public to be part of the process. Not only here but also in the months and the preceding years to now you have gone out of your way to hold public forums and meetings.

McKim asked what the consequences are if the motion to find the project in compliance with the Complete Streets policy does not pass at this point.

Desmond said there is no clear, direct answer to be found in the Complete Streets policy. We have a provision within the policy where if something changes with a project that was previously certified as Complete Streets compliant which necessitates recertification of that project, it will come back to the MPO and the MPO Policy Committee can consider removing funding from the project. It's not an absolute that funding has to be removed from that project. It gives you the opportunity to consider removing funding for that project. There is no direction to specify what to do if a new project wants to come in to the TIP and be certified and is not. He thinks it would fall along the same lines as if a project was in the TIP and you had to reconsider it. You have the option of not funding it, but you also still have the option of funding it even if it is not Complete Streets compliant.

McDaniel said we would have the opportunity to remove funding from a project in the TIP.

Desmond said the Policy Committee could make a decision to amend the TIP to add or remove any project.

McDaniel said the bottom line is it doesn't really do anything.

Martin asked if there was a waiver that is available from Complete Streets?

Desmond said you can petition for a waiver from the Complete Streets policy. That would also go through the Policy Committee.

Martin asked if a waiver would have a set of criteria associated with it.

Desmond said there is a Section 4 exemption from the policy which has a list of 7 criteria which may be used to justify exempting a project from Complete Streets compliance. Some examples include if it's an ordinary maintenance activity, if it's a roadway that bicycles and pedestrians are prohibited by law from using, if there are extreme topographic or natural resource constraints that prevent accommodating certain users, if the projected average daily traffic is very low, if there is a projected absence of need to accommodate certain users in the 20 year horizon, if there is a reasonable or equivalent alternative to accommodate users beside what may have been included in the particular project, and if the road is not a project that is subject to the discretion of the MPO.

Martin said there are a set of standards to use to determine if the Complete Streets policy did not apply to a particular project.

Desmond said you can make a finding of exemption from the project.

Johnson said Wooden said the lanes would be 11 feet but it seems they are not consistently 11. What is the travel lane? Once you have the bike lane in and the striping in, what is the width of the travel lane?

Wooden said the width of the travel lane based on the pavement markings put down would be placed such that the width between the pavement markings is 11 feet wide. The asphalt would be wider, but the pavement markings that would be placed down would be placed such that the width would be 11 feet.

Johnson asked if that width would be consistent throughout the entire corridor.

Wooden said it will be consistent through Phase II of the corridor.

Williams said this is consistent with what we did in Phase I which was found to be Complete Streets compliant. I would hope this board will continue to find this project Complete Streets compliant.

Ryterband said Phase I was in a commercial area. Phase II is a change in basic use of the corridor because we're getting in to a residential area. That in and of itself makes it different from Phase I. Even if the striping brings it down to 11 feet, the visual effect is still that of a 16 foot wide roadway which increases speed and decreases safety for users. I don't see how I can support this being Complete Streets compatible since safety is a large component of the Complete Streets policy and the reason for its existence.

Ruff said the first thing he wants to do is remind everyone, in case some perspective has been lost, that the County is doing everything they can with this project to address all the interests and concerns of people. There are competing interests and

balancing them is a very difficult thing to do. Williams and all our county officials care very much about the corridor, about the neighborhoods, about the residents, about every aspect that's been discussed. He understands some people believe a wide one way corridor may gain some safety benefits, for example reducing the chance of a collision from traffic coming at each other on a traditional two lane street. However, what has been shown and has been proven to calm traffic is when you have a two lane road. It calms traffic dramatically. The calmest, safest street to drive in the city is probably Woodlawn where it's so tight with parking and cars coming at each other. This is not the safest design that could be reasonably achieved. He thinks there are reasonable design differences that could increase the safety, which isn't the only aspect of the complete streets. Complete Streets is in no small part about context and he also questions whether that was given the proper weight in the calculation and the proper consideration. For him, Complete Streets is also about the idea of sustainability. The idea isn't just to provide facilities for pedestrians and bicycles and transit, but also to provide people the opportunity to be healthier and use alternative transportation and reduce our environmental impact. The argument is there that it should be connected, but over building a road way that will almost certainly induce more vehicle miles traveled than a different design is just not a sustainable approach. It doesn't look towards the greener future that he believe is inherent in the whole idea of why we have a complete streets policy. It misses the intent of Complete Streets to overbuild the roadway itself but to provide the facilities. In his opinion, this needs to be significantly redesigned in order to meet the Complete Streets policy. The connection between Fullerton and Gordon can be and should be done, but it should be done not with an eye towards a 40 year old general plan, but rather with an eye towards the current reality and a future that looks radically different than it did 40 years ago. That's why he can't agree this meets Complete Streets policy.

Micuda said in his role as Planning and Transportation director he gets weekly inquiries and complaints regarding speed on city streets. The most common street to get complaints is a street that is 31 feet in width and that nets out to travel lanes that are 15.5 feet in width. It was built in the suburbs 20 or 30 years ago when it was really common to do that design. Those are the streets we struggle with in terms of speed, in terms of requests for traffic calming, and some of the things that have historically been tough issues at the city. The equation of a 40 MPH design speed and the 16 feet in width, put him in a position where he thinks there will be speed issues for county residents and maybe eventually city residents. So reluctantly, he won't be able to support this being Complete Streets compliant.

McKim said he appreciates the members of the public and Wooden from American Structurepoint for coming out today. He sympathizes with the neighbors along the road who feel like they're going to be losing something. While he thinks there are still some design changes that need to be made in order to preserve neighborhoods and insure pedestrians can cross the road safely at key points, he thinks what the neighborhoods are going to end up with will be something that will be an asset, not a detriment. It will be an attractive boulevard with sidewalks, multi-use path, on street bike lanes, that's easier for bicyclists and pedestrians to use and to cross. It is easier to cross 16 feet of one way traffic than 22 feet of bidirectional traffic. Most importantly, this project does add east/west connectivity in a transportation grid that sorely lacks it and desperately needs it. This is not the end of the process from his perspective. Even if the project is found compliant with the Complete Streets policy, there are still some opportunities for refinement of the project and maybe narrowing in some places. His understanding is Williams and American Structurepoint are working on opportunities for that right now and are also planning to address and

answer questions from the CAC at the next meeting. With that, he is going to support this motion.

\*\*\*Roll was taken. Motion passed, 8:4:1.

- c. 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program\*-  
Dragovich presented. The TIP is not much different. Half of it was presented last month because the 2014-2017 TIP was reviewed. This is a 2016 to 2019 TIP. The years 2016 and 2017 are exactly the same as the presentation last month. She discussed years 2018 and 2019 in the interest of time. This is a list of projects we are going to fund using our federal allocation. We have gone through the typical process where we work with our LPAs and they send us applications and then we try our best to fund those projects using our annual allocation and our prior year balances that have rolled over. You'll notice that our annual HSIP allocation in 2016, our prior year balance as well as our annual HSIP allocation for 2018 and our HSIP annual allocation as well as some Transportation Alternatives Programming prior year balances for 2019 have not been programmed. Those will be programmed in the coming months with a second call for projects. We have included state projects, but those projects do not draw down from our local allocation.

For the County, we have Fullerton Pike Phase I, Fullerton Pike Phase II, Karst Farm Greenway Phase III. There's nothing new about those. They've been in the TIP for quite a bit and all the funding will be funded in 2016. As presented last time, the county has a signal back plates project and their bridge inspection and inventory.

City of Bloomington projects include the Dunn and 37 street project; a signal upgrade with construction slated for 2018 using our annual allocation and some ROW funding in 2016 at Tapp and Rockport Rd; the Black Lumber Trail as presented at your last meeting; a rapid flashing rectangular beacon at Allen St and Walnut St as from the meeting last month; the Moore's Pike Guardrail that was approved last month; the Woodlawn Ave railroad crossing that was reviewed today and is slated for construction in 2016; a pedestrian island at 4th St and Rogers St; signal replacement at 3rd St and Woodscrest; side path design at E. Rogers Rd as well as S Henderson St would take place in 2017; a Winslow Rd side path; downtown curb ramps which have been in the TIP for a number of years will be in construction in 2017; the Jackson Creek Trail for 2018 and 2019 is proposed to have design over two years and using our annual TAP allocation in 2018 and 2019 with the addition of some prior year balances; 17th St reconstruction; and 2nd St and College Ave signal replacement upgrade. That is all for city projects.

There are a number of Bloomington Transit projects. In 2019 they would purchase passenger shelters. They have their operational assistance for 2018 and 2019. They'd also like to purchase a number of major vehicle components such as transmission rebuilds, hybrid batteries and things like that in 2018 and 2019 and two BT Access vehicles in both 2018 and 2019. They are requesting funding for support vehicle replacement, 2 2009 vans in 2019 and then 1 1998 forklift in 2019 as well as 1 2008 SUV in 2018. The exhaust system replacement, fleet maintenance software, and surveillance equipment for the Grimes Ln facility were presented last month. They are requesting a two-way radio communication equipment upgrade in 2018 so that staff in the Grimes Ln facility can communicate with buses that are out. There is a request for 35 foot hybrid bus replacement, 2 vehicles in 2018 and then 4 in 2019. Replacement of fare collection equipment in 2018. This would be to replace their entire fare collection system on the buses and then also within the facility itself. They are requesting funding to continue their Mobility Management program. This is not new to the TIP, but they are asking for funding

in 2018 and 2019. Finally there is the 40 foot diesel bus replacement with nothing new here from what was presented last month.

Moving on the Rural Transit projects. There isn't anything to present differently from last month except for their operational assistance for 2018 and 2019.

We have a few INDOT projects that are the same as was presented last month. There include repavement of SR 45 from 46 to Unionville, I69 Section 5 and SR 45/46 repavement projects on either side of SR 37. There is a SR 37 repavement project on the southern portion of the I69/37 where Section 5 meets up with Section 4. They would pave the section of 37 just south of there. Like the county, INDOT is wanting to upgrade several signals to add the visibility backing plates on SR 46. They have their usual bridge inspections, underwater bridge inspections, and bridge load rating inspections.

Those are all the projects within the TIP. We received a number of public comments throughout the comment period and also some outside the comment period. I provided to you all the comments that were received. She sent an email this morning with the additional comments received this week and then she received two more right after she sent the email, so she printed them off and handed them to you so you would have all public comments to review. If you didn't receive the email she has a copy here you can review. The TAC and CAC did review the 2016-2019 TIP. The TAC voted unanimously to recommend approval of the TIP. The CAC, however, voted approval of the TIP with the exclusion of Fullerton Pike Phase I and Phase II.

Desmond had a couple of reports to follow up on some issues raised at the last meeting. First of these was a question about how we can use out HSIP funding. As you know, many of the intersections that see the highest crash rates in our community are those between local roads and state roads. In the past, we have not attempted to spend our local HSIP funding on those particular types of allocations, we focused on purely local road applications. He did follow up with INDOT on that. It turns out we can in fact work on joint projects with our district to do improvements with our HSIP funding. We would have to have a written endorsement from the district traffic engineer in order for central office to consider it for eligibility review for HSIP, so we would require close coordination and approval through the district in order to do that but he thinks it is a possibility for us to open up new avenues to consider those types of projects. We will make that known to our LPAs as we move forward with future calls for projects. If we think there's something we can address cooperatively with the state on one of their facilities as it impacts us locally that's something we can consider doing. It came as a pleasant surprise, so we'll move forward with that knowledge and be able to get some things done. He also wanted to also address the issue of funding the 17th St project. Right now, it is proposed in the TIP as a federal participation project using our local allocation of funds. As we all know, that project is in large part necessitated by the impact of the I69 project and the impending connection of Vernal Pike across the highway which will increase traffic through that area. The city did have a very productive meeting with Deputy Commissioner Jim Stark and Chief of Staff Chris Keiffer last week to continue the discussion of partnering with INDOT, which hadn't been explored very deeply up to this point. A couple of options were laid on the table in terms of directions we could go to get some additional funding from the state assist with that particular project. Those opportunities were laid before the City and it's incumbent on the City to put a more specific proposal together and submit that to INDOT so they can begin vetting it and we can enter into some more specific negotiations about how that might happen. While the project is in the TIP right now for federal funding as proposed with our local funds, the opportunities is still out there for us to substitute some other funds and maybe free up some MPO funds to be used in other projects in those particular years. Right now we're

going forward as proposed, but it was a productive meeting, there are some positive opportunities out there and those discussions will certainly continue in earnest as we go forward to try to develop this project. He expects to hear more about that in the coming months in particular and possibly creating a TIP amendment if a final agreement can be reached. He pointed out that immediately after that meeting, some County representatives met with the same folks from INDOT to discuss some county project concerns and partnering opportunities.

McDaniel said it's nice to hear there has been some progress.

Ruff asked how the CAC constructed a vote without something rather than dividing the question.

Ryterband said they did divide the question. They divided it to approve the TIP minus those projects and then voted on those projects separately.

\*\*\*Baker made a motion to approve the 2016-2019 TIP. Martin seconded.

Floor was opened for public comment. There was none.

McKim thanked Dragovich for providing the additional public testimony that arrived at the last minute. There's a sentence in there that he asked to have addressed. There's a sentence that appears in identical form in probably half the comments received. "We also take issue with the idea of approving sections of this project in piece-meal fashion and feel the public is being misled about the true costs involved in this project." He asked if it's not standard or unusual to phase projects in this way or to program projects in multiple phases?

Johnson said it's very common. We've done that for decades because of the match requirement and being able to pool the money necessary to move forward. It's quite common.

Ryterband said while she supports connectivity and she thinks it's certainly the one thing we should be looking for in all our roadways, whether they be neighborhood or commercial, Fullerton Pike Phase II is a residential neighborhood. Whenever we're designing roadways, we should be focused on context sensitive design. While we may be trying to connect the east and west of our town in the southern section, this is a residential neighborhood and the commercial section is not far away. The only piece of commercial real estate is at Walnut. The rest is residential and includes 2 middle schools. To create a roadway that is much too large and is over designed for the context seems not only unduly expensive but unfair. This project was proposed 40 or 50 years ago and it was proposed before this residential neighborhood was created. To say we need to go ahead with it because it's been in the long range plan for eons is not a sufficient reason to design it in the way we have. Our notions of roadways have changed in the last 40 years. I still don't believe the design as we are approving it by placing it in the TIP is a reasonable design proposal. I will be voting against the TIP because Fullerton is a part of it.

Thomas asked how much the design can change once it is in the TIP, especially if it's going to be designed down. She still has some ideas regarding the design for Fullerton, but she also understands we have a timeline. She's trying to compromise and work with both aspects.

Williams said he's been sitting here taking notes as the meeting has progressed. What he anticipates doing is getting with Wooden, taking the residents' input and hopefully making some compromises yet still satisfying the needs laid out in the original plan.

Johnson said this is a really good question. If we were to approve the design as an 11 foot section with no median and no turn lane and it came back designed differently with 16 foot travel lanes and a 16 foot median, we wouldn't accept that kind of significant change. Either this body agrees that we have approved it as designed or we agree that we haven't. You can't go through this public process and then switch the shells on what everybody has assumed and agreed they are voting on. She voted no on this design and would like to see some modifications made, but the flip of this could happen to a community and none of us would want that to happen.

Thomas said that's her concern and why she was asking about the parameters of what could change or not change.

Martin said he doesn't think what we do is specify the design in any way. What we specify is maximum amount of dollars that can be spent in each phase in each of the three categories over time. Those are the parameters of the decision we're making. How that is carried out is a different part of the process that we don't participate in directly. Thomas, as a Commissioner, you have a responsibility to the County and highway department, so you are certainly going to be involved, McKim will be involved as somebody who's actually working with the county and has some authority over whether the funds are available to do matching. This is a long process that occurs and he doesn't think the decisions we make have anything to do other than specifying the maximum amount of dollars to come from which funds to be applied to which categories of expense over which periods of time. That's what we do.

Johnson said we also make a decision about whether the project is complete streets or not. A project can't become non-compliant with Complete Streets and not have to come back to this body for discussion. She's not suggesting that's going to happen on this project. If anything, it's going to become more complete streets compliant. The larger question is can a design significantly change without coming back here. She thinks the answer is no.

Martin said that's essentially correct. The question in those discussions is what is a significant enough change to come back. That's why we set an upper level on the expenses, not the lower limit on the expenses.

Baker said while it's theoretically possible something could be slipped by us in some way, we've got a number of people on this committee with eyes to these projects and with sufficient meetings and reviews that we would pretty well immediately catch that. That's part of our business for being here, is to make sure these things are carried through in the manner we think they should be.

Ruff asked if there was an cost estimate ever done of a project in this segment that looks a lot different, that's 2 lane, no median, appropriate improvements at intersections. Has that been done?

Williams said it hasn't. As you recall, we started out with 2 lanes in each direction and then turn lanes at the critical locations. We basically just eliminated the one lane in each direction.

Ruff said this is a costly project and when you add in the other phases, it eats up a lot of MPO funds. He's concerned it eats up more because it's over designed and overbuilt for what's appropriate and needed. It represents a huge opportunity cost, especially when you add in the other phases. Someone brought up the phasing and how we often do phased projects. That's quite true. He suggests that, particularly in this case, it stands the chance of creating additional momentum or justification for building the other phases to match the previously built phases and compounding the problems. He doesn't really want to vote no on the TIP because of his issues with the design. He's thinking about making a motion to divide the question so those who don't want to support this but want to support the TIP have the opportunity to do so and state on the record why. He added this is a long-standing principle he's had. When the city proposed what he considered to be an overbuild roundabout at Sare and Rogers Rd, he vehemently opposed it for many of the same reasons and actually ended up holding up the final budget approval for that year. It's very consistent with his principles. It has nothing to do with the city or the county. He knows county officials, both appointed and elected, care deeply and are trying to get the most benefit for every one in the community in some balanced way. To him, the compromise is a little further in the opposite direction. To him, it starts off with no connection as it is now and the other extreme is the larger design. The compromise for him is what we've talked about during the course of this meeting. So, with in mind, procedurally is it too late to divide the question and first to have a quick vote on Fullerton and then vote on the rest of the TIP or has that train left the station?

McDaniel said it's a motion to amend the motion on the floor. I think that's appropriate.

\*\*\*Ruff made an amendment to the motion to approve the TIP without DES#150023. Ryterband seconded.

McDaniel said the motion to amend means you are voting to take the item out of the TIP.

Desmond said you're voting to consider it separately from the rest of the TIP. You're dividing the motion into two motions. There will be one motion to consider everything but Fullerton and then one motion to consider Fullerton.

McDaniel said the motion to amend does not mean we will remove Fullerton, it means we will consider it separately. If the motion passes, we have to vote on the TIP with everything except Fullerton Pike and then whether or not Fullerton Pike gets put into the TIP. If you vote no on the motion, then you're saying we want to leave it intact and we want to vote on the TIP as presented.

\*\*\*Roll was taken. Motion failed, 5:8.

Desmond said you're back to the original motion, considering the TIP as a whole.

McDaniel said unless there are any other comments, we'll vote.

Baker said if the motion stays, we have to have a second and a discussion and continue through.

\*\*\*Banach made a motion to approve the TIP as proposed. McKim seconded.

Baker said we're eliminating the discussion. The easiest thing to do is just go ahead and vote. We're ready anyhow. We're not going to protract this any further.

Banach and McKim withdrew their motion.

Banach said he was just trying to get a vote.

McDaniel said we're back to the original motion.

\*\*\*Roll was taken. Motion passed, 12:1.

VIII. Communications from Committee Members (*non-agenda items*):

Martin said at the last meeting we took an action to get the attention of INDOT about a plight we had. He personally thanked Liz Erwin for putting together a meeting with the I69 collaboration group that's been meeting for some time now to discuss the issue. He also wanted to personally thank Jim Stark for coming down and engaging with city and county staff and some of our officials for helping us understand the opportunities we had to partner with INDOT on these projects and get them moving forward. He took a little bit of heat for initiating this, but it had the desired effect and he wanted to thank the people who got involved with carrying it forward. It will help us going forward. We just need to make sure the momentum continues.

McDaniel thanked Martin. That did work out pretty well.

- a. Topic Suggestions for Future Agendas

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- a. Technical Advisory Committee – May 27 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
- b. Citizens Advisory Committee – May 27 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
- c. Policy Committee – June 12 at 1:30 p.m. (Council Chambers)

Adjournment

*\*Action Requested / Public comment prior to vote (limited to five minutes per speaker)*